



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/777,336	12/27/96	HOLMES	7-2

S H DWORETSKY  
AT&T CORPORATION  
P O BOX 4110  
MIDDLETOWN NJ 07748

LM12/0505

EXAMINER  
GELIN, J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2744	9

DATE MAILED: 05/05/99

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

# Advisory Action

Application No.  
08/777,336

Applicant(s)  
David W.J. Holmes

Examiner  
Jean A. Gelin

Group Art Unit  
2744



## THE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE: [check only a) or b)]

- a) ☒ expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ expires either three months from the mailing date of the final rejection, or on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.

Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.

- ☐ Appellant's Brief is due two months from the date of the Notice of Appeal filed on \_\_\_\_\_ (or within any period for response set forth above, whichever is later). See 37 CFR 1.191(d) and 37 CFR 1.192(a).

Applicant's response to the final rejection, filed on Apr 8, 1999 has been considered with the following effect, but is NOT deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:

- ☐ The proposed amendment(s):
- ☐ will be entered upon filing of a Notice of Appeal and an Appeal Brief.
  - ☐ will not be entered because:
    - ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See note below).
    - ☐ they raise the issue of new matter. (See note below).
    - ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.
    - ☐ they present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_

- ☐ Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_

- ☐ Newly proposed or amended claims \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.

- ☒ The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Prior arts of record teach the claimed invention, as detailed in the last Office Action.

- ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

- ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):

Claims allowed: \_\_\_\_\_

Claims objected to: \_\_\_\_\_

Claims rejected: 1-16 and 21

- ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ ☐ has ☐ has not been approved by the Examiner.

- ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

- ☒ Other See the attached response to arguments.

J.G (703) 305-4847

Art Unit: 2744

***Response to Arguments***

1. This is in response to the applicant's arguments received on December 27, 1999 in which Claims 1-16, 21 are pending; claims 17-20 are canceled. After a complete review of the response and claims, Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Therefore, the rejection mailed on 01/08/99 remains.


**Remark**

Applicant argues that the mobile station of the present invention can camp on two different over the air networks, but it can only camp on one network at a time. Applicant further argues that the mobile radio telephone of Gillig can connect on two different over the air networks, but the radio telephone is on both networks simultaneously. However, the Examiner believes that the radio telephone taught by Gillig can connect on two different over the air networks one at a time, e.g., if the user has selected the dual-mode feature, the user can be alerted of an incoming call on the alternate system (col. 6, lines 50-65). Also, see paper # 7.

J. Gelin

April 28, 1999

J. G

  
DWAYNE D. BOST  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
GROUP 2700